

d.) Remarks

Claims 1-31 are pending in this application. Claim 1, 11, 13, 15, 23, and 24 have been amended in various particulars as indicated hereinabove. New Claims 25-31 have been added to alternatively define Applicants' invention.

Do
This

Turning to the Office Action, Summary Page, acknowledgement of the claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) is respectfully requested. The instant application claims the benefit of the filing date of Provisional Application 60/195,636.

Turning to the issue of the citation of references, the Office Action noted that, absent a list of the patents that were mentioned in the specification, the patents would not be considered. Applicants note that an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) by Applicant was filed together with the subject application on July 11, 2000. A copy of the previously filed IDS (in addition to a new IDS) is attached for the Examiner's convenience. Each of the documents cited in the "Background" section of the application is cited in the IDS. Consideration of each of the documents and return of the Examiner-initialed IDS form are respectfully requested.

The drawings were objected to under Rule 83 for allegedly failing to show the end face of the optical fiber being located within 1 millimeter of the front face, as recited in claims 2 and 14. This objection is respectfully traversed. The drawings clearly show this claim feature. Figure 2, for example, illustrates fiber endfaces 36 being located flush with the front face 34. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

The drawings were also objected to under Rule 84 because they failed to mention reference numeral 46, described in the specification, at page 7, line 19. Fig. 3 is proposed to be amended to include this reference numeral.

The drawings were also objected to because a reference sign was not provided for the integrated optic chip. Figs. 3, 4, and 5 have been amended to add reference number "41" for the chip. Corresponding amendments have been made to the specification.

The disclosure was objected to for a spelling error on page 8, line 25. This has been corrected, along with a number of other formalities, identified by the Applicants, as indicated by the foregoing amendments to the specification. Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful review of the specification.

Claims 15 and 23 were also objected to. The suggested changes to the claims have been made in the foregoing amendments.

Claims 2, 6, 7, 14, 19, and 22 were objected to because limitations that were recited in claims were not described in the specification. The foregoing amendments to the specification add these limitations of the claims.

Turning now to the rejections, claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

The phrase "a front face opposite the rear portion", in claims 1 and 13, was deemed objectionable. This phrase has been removed from both of the claims.

Relative to claim 15, Applicants respectfully wish to avoid changing the claim. It is believed that claim 15 is definite as it stands. It is true to say that the "wick stop trench" is between the rear portion and the front portion. It is also true to say that the wick stop trench is between the rear portion and the middle portion as in claim 16. In short, both statements are accurate.

Relative to claim 11, the "V-grooves" was changed to "the V-groove".

Generally, the Applicants are thankful for the helpful suggestions from Examiner concerning both the claims and the specification, and the suggestions for modifications thereto.

Claims 1, 3, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by JP 410227948A (hereinafter Yamashita Document). In related rejections, Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over the

Yamashita Document and claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Yamashita Document in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,557,695 to Yamane, *et al.* or U.S. Pat. No. 4,639,074 to Murphy. In addition, claims 13, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,926,599 to Bookbinder, *et al.*, in view of the Yamane, *et al.* Patent. These rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Claims 1 and 23 are directed to optical fiber array apparatus, including a V-groove chip, having a rear portion, a front portion, and a front face. Optical fibers are not bonded to the front portion, which is in proximity to an integrated optical chip or optoelectronic device. Claim 13 concerns a system in which the optical fiber is bonded to the rear portion of the V-groove chip, not bonded to the middle portion of the V-groove chip, and is bonded to the bonded front portion of the V-groove chip, which is in proximity to the integrated optics chip or optoelectronic device.

In short, the claims are directed to fiber coupling to an integrated optical chip or optoelectronic device. In contrast, the Yamashita Document and Bookbinder patent are directed to fiber-to-fiber coupling.

Only the Murphy and the Yamana, *et al.* Patents address the coupling to a chip. Both of them use a conventional, nonsegmented V-groove system, however.

In summary, the present claimed invention is directed to a problem different from that addressed by the primary references. The secondary references merely teach a conventional solution.

Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. Should any questions arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Date: July 25, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By

J. Grant Houston, Reg. No.: 35,900
Customer No. 29127
Houston Eliseeva LLP
4 Militia Drive, Ste. 4
Lexington, MA 02421
Tel.: 781 863 9991
Fax: 781 863 9931